

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,220	01/19/2001	Bum-hee Lee	1293.1161	7430
21171	7590 11/03/2004		EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			LANEAU, RONALD	
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			3627	
			DATE MAILED: 11/03/200	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	- (
Advisory Action	09/764,220	LEE, BUM-HEE	SI				
Autisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Ronald Laneau	3627					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 17 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicated) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	to a tion in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	•						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriate or the fee.	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or				
timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	CFR 1.704(b).)				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	•						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Se		dered but does NO	Γ place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bec raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: none.							
Claim(s) objected to: none.							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-19.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: none.							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).						
10. Other:	(), = = () = () () () () () () ()						
							
Ronald Donesu							

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments seem to be pointed to the web browser being organized according to geographic information of the agencies. This is not a patentable feature and almost every large retail sore can be organized in such a way. One can be shopping at Macys store over the Internet, purchase anything and be able to pick up the item from the closest store or it's done in such a way that the closest store wherein the item is available ship it to the customer. That way, the customer saves on the cost of the shipping for said item being that it's coming from the closest store to the customer. Applicant's arguments have been found unpersuasive, the Examiner maintains the Final action..